

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

CLIFFORD A. LOWE, *et al.*,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SHIELDMARK, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 1:19-cv-748

OPINION & ORDER
[Related Doc. 115]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

“To sustain a protective order under Rule 26(c), the moving party must show ‘good cause’ for protection from one (or more) harms identified in Rule 26(c)(1)(A) ‘with a particular and specific demonstration of fact, as distinguished from stereotyped and conclusory statements.’”¹

In this case, the parties jointly requested that the Court approve a Stipulated Protective Order, but did not provide the Court with the grounds supporting that request.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the protective order without prejudice. The parties may refile the order with the appropriate motion discussing the Rule 26(c) standard.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: June 17, 2022

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ *In re Ohio Execution Protocol Litig.*, 845 F.3d 231, 236 (6th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Serrano v. Cintas Corp.*, 699 F.3d 884, 901 (6th Cir. 2012)); see also *Procter & Gamble Co. v. Bankers Tr. Co.*, 78 F.3d 219, 227 (6th Cir. 1996) (rejecting joint protective order).